



Draft Summer Village of Larkspur & Westlock County Intermunicipal Development Plan

WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

Report to Steering Committee and Councils | September 22, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. OVERVIEW	1
2. JUNE 2021 ONLINE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SESSION	1
3. COMMUNITY FEEDBACK	1
4. AGENCY FEEDBACK	5

1. OVERVIEW

This report provides a summary of the feedback received regarding the proposed Larkspur and Westlock County Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP) from residents, stakeholders and agencies.

In February 2020, a project newsletter and survey was sent to Summer Village and County residents of the initial proposed plan area. The newsletter provided information about the proposed IDP's purpose, objectives, and proposed timeline (note: this newsletter was distributed prior to the establishment of COVID-19 restrictions in Alberta).

Feedback received as part of the winter 2020 newsletter and survey was compiled into a previous report for the Steering Committee in spring 2020.

Through 2020 and 2021, the project steering committee, with assistance from the project consultant (MPS) worked collaboratively to develop a draft IDP.

On June 14th, 2021, Municipal Planning Services (MPS) (in collaboration with the Administrations of the Summer Village of Larkspur and Westlock County) held an Online Public Engagement Session via Zoom and YouTube. The purpose of the Online Public Open House was to provide community members (of both municipalities) with information about the IDP project and to gather feedback about proposed future land use and intermunicipal referral policies. Written notification about the project was provided to landowners within the proposed plan area, as well as referral agencies with an interest in the proposed plan area.

Information about public engagement completed to date (and feedback received by MPS) is provided in this report.

2. JUNE 2021 ONLINE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SESSION

DATE AND TIME	Monday, June 14, 2021 @ 6:00 PM
FORMAT	Held virtually via Zoom and YouTube due to COVID-19 public health protocols Recorded and posted online at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W9PMSHeTAAE
ATTENDANCE	Approximately 20 live attendees 50 views on YouTube following the session (as of September 15, 2021)
PRESENTER	Jane Dauphinee, MPS
NOTIFICATION	Notification was prepared by MPS in May 2021 and posted online/distributed by the municipalities' Administration
FEEDBACK	Feedback was received from community members live at the session and via phone and email correspondences (see the following section of this report)

3. COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

The following is a summary of comments and questions received from community members at (and following) the June 2021 public engagement session. Comments have been lightly edited for clarity, brevity, anonymity, and relevancy to the IDP, where necessary for the purposes of this report.

FEEDBACK	MPS RESPONSE/RECOMMENDATION
<p>Concern noted that additional residential lots are being approved on the north side of the lake by the County.</p> <p>Observed a huge influx of boats, bigger and faster. This discourages other boat owners and recreational users of the lake.</p> <p>Long Island Lake is a shared lake and should be protected. The lake is too small to have additional development.</p> <p>Loss in lake water quality is a loss for everyone.</p>	<p>MPS recommends no changes to the IDP.</p>

<p>Landowner within the County asks if there is a requirement for landowners to improve or develop their land within a certain timeframe, and if it would be reverted to County ownership.</p>	<p>MPS notes (and indicated to the landowner directly) that there is no requirement in the County (or the Summer Village) to improve or develop a lot, and that ownership would not be reverted to the municipality.</p> <p>MPS recommends no changes to the IDP.</p>
<p>Landowner request for February 2020 newsletter and survey.</p>	<p>A copy of the newsletter and survey provided to the respondent by MPS.</p>
<p>Concern regarding that the County is not being represented, as the area Councillor resigned in 2020. Request that work on the IDP cease until an elected representative is in place.</p> <p>The purpose of this IDP is not equal, it favours one municipality over the other. The Summer Village is a stagnant municipality that will not grow, future development is limited to redevelopment of existing properties. No possibility of mutually beneficial and compatible future development.</p> <p>Regarding infrastructure, public service and public facilities, it is noted that the Summer Village has a lower tax levy which does not contribute equally to these expenses.</p> <p>The community (which includes Summer Village and County residents) is very neighbourly and helpful. And the IDP is looking for a problem, where none exist.</p>	<p><u>Re: Representation</u></p> <p>MPS notes that the Steering Committee has always included representatives of both municipalities' Councils, as appointed by the respective Councils.</p> <p><u>Re: Equity/Fairness of the Draft IDP The draft</u></p> <p>MPS notes that the IDP includes policies and processes for both municipalities to adhere to. The IDP does not address costs/contributions to intermunicipal infrastructure, services, and facilities. This would be addressed in the municipalities' Intermunicipal Collaboration Framework.</p> <p>MPS recommends no changes to the IDP.</p>
<p><u>Planning Area of the IDP:</u></p> <p>The IDP must encompass the drainage basin area.</p> <p>The subject areas of mutual interest are the health of the lake and the safety on the lake to those making use of the lake. The special areas of mutual interest are the lands within the drainage basin of the lake because waters from these areas drain into the lake before discharging to areas outside of the drainage basin; water from these lands has the potential to affect the health and safety of the lake and, therefore, to directly impact both County and Summer Village property owners.</p> <p>Noted that the boundary of the planning area should be appropriate to the issues being addressed.</p> <p>Noted that the Upper Athabasca Regional Plan has a drainage basin as its planning area. Recommends that the appropriate boundary for this IDP is the drainage basin of Long Island Lake.</p> <p><u>Development within the Drainage Basin Area:</u></p> <p>Section 5.3 of the draft IDP needs to be clarified. For example, 5.3.1 allows Country Residential Development Areas in accordance with the County MDP and bylaws, as amended. This is an unknown and can be a moving target. This vague reference should be removed and the express locations should be shown in the IDP. This should be shown for the drainage basin area.</p> <p>This is particularly concerning because the County MDP and bylaw 05-2016 (page 18) state: '...site-by-site amendments have been passed to allow increases to these</p>	<p><u>Planning Area of the IDP:</u></p> <p>Feedback relates to plan area boundary.</p> <p>MPS recommends further discussion with the Steering Committee and the municipalities' Administrations.</p> <p><u>Development within the Drainage Basin Area</u></p> <p>MPS notes that the IDP is not to take away or restrict development rights that are already provided for landowners within the County or the Summer Village though the municipalities LUBs. Care was given while developing the IDP to identify existing developments and analyze the permitted and discretionary uses in both LUBs to ensure that the IDP would not impede the use and enjoyment of existing developments within the IDP area.</p> <p>The Future Land Use map in the IDP does not identify any new multi-lot</p>

<p>limits, resulting in a large number of quarter sections where additional parcels, beyond the usual limits, have been permitted.'</p> <p>It should be made clear in the IDP that any proposals for multi-lot developments must be subject to the consultation and review provisions of the IDP.</p>	<p>country residential development areas. The only areas identify are those within existing Country Residential Land Use Districts (in the County's Land Use Bylaw) and existing country residential developments in the County.</p> <p>Additionally, the referral policies identified in the IDP already trigger the notification of the adjacent municipality when an MDP, LUB or ASP (new or amended) is proposed.</p> <p>MPS recommends no changes to the IDP.</p>
<p>The boundary of the plan is quite limited. I would like to see the planning boundary changed to take in the full drainage basin at Long Island Lake. I believe the residents of the Summer Village of Larkspur should have a say in the decision making that involves the whole lake (the entire basin) as whatever happens on one part of the lake affects all families.</p> <p>Boat safety, protecting the water quality and wildlife are just a few concerns that should rank high on the priority list and that residents of the Summer Village should have their voices heard.</p>	<p>The Steering Committee carefully considered the plan area boundary. After much discussion and debate the ½ mile plan boundary established.</p> <p>MPS agrees that there are planning merits to planning at the watershed scale. Currently, there is no watershed management plan for Long Island Lake. In the future the municipalities and other local stakeholders may wish to explore the development of a watershed management plan for the lake. Recommendations from a watershed management plan could then be incorporated into a future iteration of the IDP.</p> <p>IDPs are living documents. They are intended to be reviewed every 5 years. As more information becomes available about the lake there will be additional opportunities to revise and update the IDP to incorporate new information, best practices, and recommendations.</p> <p>MPS recommends no changes to the IDP.</p>
<p>The 'planning boundary' of the IDP must be changed to encompass the full drainage basin of Long Island Lake. The reason for this is the Summer Village exists because of the lake. Any developments within the drainage basin of the lake will impact the water quality and the boating safety of the lake and, therefore, will impact the well-being of the Summer Village.</p>	<p>See previous comments.</p>
<p>The proposed IDP boundary will not allow the Summer Village of Larkspur and the County of Westlock to work together to minimize the environmental impact to the lake. On a typical summer weekend anywhere from ten to fifteen watercraft can be seen dodging one another on the narrow south end of the lake resulting in noise, stress to waterfowl and erosion of shoreline. These watercraft include not only those of Village residents and their guests but also those of north end property owners, Rod and Gun Club campers and Municipal Campground users. Allowing further development at either end of Long Island Lake would be disappointing and puzzling as we believe it would have a catastrophic and irreversible impact on the lake.</p>	<p>See previous comments.</p>

<p>Hopefully the two municipalities can work effectively together to maintain or even improve the condition of Long Island Lake.</p>	
<p>We have concerns that the drainage basin identified on the draft IDP is very limited. The 'planning boundary' of the IDP (Larkspur/Westlock County) must be changed to encompass the full drainage basin of Long Island Lake.</p> <p>Any developments within the drainage basin of the lake will impact the water quality and the boating safety of the lake and, therefore, will impact the well-being of the Summer Village.</p>	<p>See previous comments.</p>
<p>The current boundary is much too limited in its scope for our Village.</p> <p>Respondent noted that the Summer Village has the most number of residents with a direct interest in the health of the lake.</p> <p>The IDP Boundary for the Summer Village needs to include the entire lake boundary. Any drainage and/or future developments on the lake at any location would severely impact the entire lake, including our community.</p> <p>The Larkspur community has the best interests of Long Island Lake at heart, as many of our residents call this lake home year round, and all others have invested interests in the properties in the Summer Village.</p> <p>Any changes to the lake affect the water for the entire body of water, so it only makes sense that the IDP boundary includes the entire lake.</p>	<p>See previous comments.</p>
<p>The planning boundary should be changed to encompass the full drainage basin at Long Island Lake.</p> <p>Safety should be a high priority, as this lake has many families enjoying this lake.</p> <p>Noted reduction in number of waterfowl noted around the lake.</p>	<p>See previous comments.</p>
<p>The IDP appears to provide a reasonable framework to understand the current environment and indicate what items of discussion will likely become topics of future development and planning between Westlock County and the Summer Village of Larkspur and to suggest mechanisms for joint planning.</p> <p>The major issue is the geographic scope. The scope should be changed before proceeding further. The expected scope of an IDP like this is normally the watershed of the associated lake.</p> <p>An IDP involving the entire lake makes sense in so many ways. Development anywhere around the lake, collectively impacts the entirety of the lake. Things like runoff, chemical introductions, stormwater, frequency/type of usage, water contamination, lake health, lake shore damage/restoration, introduction of foreign plants/animals, low impact design, low cost mitigation... etc. are all impacted by all of those living and managing the lakeshore and watershed.</p> <p>All of the joint lake impacts are inextricably inter-twined with the other valid joint IDP planning items identified in the plan such as boundary roads, services, wastewater management, wildfire protection... these can and should continue to be included as frames of reference for joint planning within the expanded IDP geographic scope.</p>	<p>See previous comments.</p>
<p>Request to be email notified of any future public engagement opportunities.</p>	<p>MPS recorded the respondent's contact information and will email notified of future engagement opportunities.</p>
<p>County resident noted that their property is included within the IDP plan area, and objects to being included.</p>	<p>MPS recommends no changes to the IDP.</p>

<p>Indication of concerns about notification (believes they were not notified), deadline for written comments, transparency from County Council and Administration.</p> <p>Requested information regarding a rumored 200 lot development in the County.</p>	<p>Comments were shared with the County who contacted the writer.</p> <p>Response period was extended to ensure that community members will have time to review the document and provide comments.</p> <p>MPS notes that no subdivision application (for 200 lots near Long Island Lake) has been made to the County's subdivision authority at this time.</p> <p>MPS recommends no changes to the IDP.</p>
---	---

4. AGENCY FEEDBACK

The following is a summary of feedback received from referral agencies (provincial departments, local service and utility providers, etc.) with an interest in future land use and development in the area.

REFERRAL AGENCY	FEEDBACK	MPS RESPONSE/RECOMMENDATION
Alberta Culture and Status of Women	No comments	
Alberta Energy Regulator	No comments	
Alberta Environment and Parks	<p>Policy 5.4.1 states: <i>“Active and passive recreational uses will be encouraged within crown land and conservation area.”</i></p> <p>AEP is fine with the public using crown land for recreation purposes, but for conservation areas there are times when active and passive uses might not be allowed due to the restriction level of the conservation area. So by encouraging the use of the site the municipalities might be taking on the liability for authorizing people to use the site when they cannot use them for certain activities. AEP recommends that this section get re-worded</p>	<p>MPS recommends that Policy 5.4.1 be reworded (as follows) to reflect the response from AEP:</p> <p><i>“Recreational uses may be allowed within the Crown Land and Conservation Area where necessary approvals from the province have been obtained.”</i></p>
Alberta Health Services	<p>No concerns, included general planning recommendations that address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving communication with government agencies • Affordable housing • Transportation modes • Healthy food systems • Environmental conservation • Communication networks • Emergency preparedness 	<p>MPS notes that these recommendations are best addressed through the individual municipality's planning and/or strategic planning documents.</p> <p>MPS will share these recommendations with the County and Summer Village.</p> <p>MPS recommends no changes to the IDP.</p>
Alberta Transportation	No comments	
Athabasca Watershed Council	No comments	
Canada Post	No comments	

Fortis Alberta	No comments	
Pembina Gas Co-op	No comments	
Pembina Hills School	No comments	
Telus Communications	No comments	